



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CHILD LABOR PROBLEM—A STUDY IN DEGENERACY¹

BY A. J. MCKELWAY,

Assistant Secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

It is my purpose to draw a parallel, not to make a prophecy. The parallel, however, is so striking, the conditions of the child labor problem in England at the beginning of the nineteenth century and in some of our American States at the beginning of the twentieth so like, that the foreseeing of the same result is inevitable, even while we pray, *Utinam vates falsus sim*. May this association, with its scientific study of the problem and its fearless setting forth of truth discovered, be one of the forces in our American life that shall work a timely change in those conditions here. Certainly there is no more pressing subject of consideration for patriot or philanthropist than the welfare of the coming race. As President Roosevelt said to our committee only last month, political questions like the tariff or the currency are insignificant, in comparison with a social problem like this. The life is more than meat and the body than raiment. Certainly there could befall a people no greater catastrophe than race degeneracy. It is sufficient to say here that this catastrophe is not only threatening but already impending.

In drawing the parallel between conditions in England and America, I shall confine my attention mainly to the Southern States, and for these reasons: As a Southern man I am more familiar with Southern conditions by personal investigation; the field of work assigned me is the South; in the manufacturing States of the North and East the legislative problem has been largely solved, and there remains only the problem of the adequate enforcement of the law; the industry which was chiefly cursed by child labor in England is the characteristic and commanding industry of the South, the manufacture of cotton; and the northern problem differs from the southern in being chiefly a foreign problem. It is the children of the French Canadian and the Portuguese and the Greek that

¹Paper Read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, New Orleans, January 1, 1906.

demand protection in New England, the children of the Italian and the Slav in Pennsylvania. No child of American parentage has yet been found at work in the sweatshops of New York city. Where there is opportunity for making manhood wages, the typical American sends his child to the school and not to the mill. But while it is a grievous thing to consider that the good fortune of the immigrant's family is offset by the misfortune of the child, who is kept from too early toil by the humane laws of the Old World States, while child labor in the North and East prevents that transformation into American citizens that is effected by the American public schools, yet in the South it is especially an American problem, for it is concerned with the depreciation of the purest American stock on the continent. And this gives us another point of comparison between England and the South, namely the similarity of the racial stock. The little children who were fed into the capacious maw of the Manchester cotton mills were English. The little child slaves of our southern cotton mills to-day are of the same breed. And without going into the sphere of rhetoric, it may be said that at this hour of the world's history it is still the dominant race, the race of victorious achievement in war and in peace, unconquerable save when pitted against itself, as at Kings Mountain or New Orleans or Gettysburg. It is a race whose integrity must be preserved as the only safeguard of the national greatness. And it is because I plead to-day for the children of those who met the British at Kings Mountain, who followed Andrew Jackson to New Orleans, who fought on both sides at Chicamauga, that I am in such deadly earnest. We must save these children for their country. We must protect them from the consequences of untimely toil, the sapping of physical vitality, the marring of the mind and the spoiling of the spirit that come with the denial of the rights of childhood. We must train these children and those that are to come after them for their country's service. So only shall we win the enduring victories of peace and

"So shall we bide sure-guarded,
When the restless lightnings wake,
In the womb of the blotting war-cloud,
And the pallid nations shake."

We have a hundred years of legislative history in England as our warning that we must hasten to protect our children here.

Hutchins & Harrison have recently published a "History of Factory Legislation," to which I am largely indebted in the preparation of this paper. The first of the Factory acts in England was passed in 1802. But that followed a period of ineffective protest against the evil. The attitude of the eighteenth century towards the employment of children was one of self-laudation, that for the first time in the history of the world the child was no longer an encumbrance but an asset. Defoe and other writers were filled with enthusiasm that children of tenderest years could be profitably employed and a district in which "scarce anything of five years old" but could earn its living was regarded as an ideal state of society. And yet in the twentieth century children of four and five years have been found at work in New York city in the artificial flower trade in the home that poverty had turned into a workshop. In an account of the workhouses of England, written in 1732, the writer considered the picking of oakum as an ideally healthful pursuit for children. "They that pick oakum," he says, "are continually refreshed by the balsamic odour of it; the spinners and knitters, with an exercise so moderate that it fits any age or sex, at the same time that it qualifies those that are young for most handicrafts." Children were set to work in the spinning rooms soon after they were five years old. But this is also a pleasing modern sentiment. The cotton mill, with its twelve-hour day, or its twelve-hour night, the room filled with flying lint, trying to adult lungs, is held up as a sort of paradise for children and ignorant parents are to-day enticed from the farms with the idea that the children that are too young for farm work can be employed at the light and even delightful labor of the mills, wet weather and dry, hot weather and cold. Constant employment was once regarded as the wisest philanthropy, on the naive theory that "being constantly employed at least twelve hours a day . . . we hope the rising generation will be so habituated to constant employment that it would at length prove agreeable and entertaining to them." Though the mercenary was also then a little mixed with the philanthropic by the well-founded belief that "from children thus trained up to constant labour we may venture to hope the lowering of the price." That is from an *Essay on Trade* published in 1770.

It should be said, however, that the children here spoken of were pauper children, which were already a "problem." The sturdy

farmers of England had not as yet learned to sentence their own flesh and blood to hard labor from early childhood. But a committee from the House of Commons in 1767 collected such appalling figures of mortality among the parish children that an appropriation was made for their care, though they were still apprenticed as soon as possible. In 1784 came the memorable protest of the Manchester physicians, with Dr. Percival as spokesman. They had investigated a fever epidemic at the Radcliffe cotton works, and while they professed ignorance of its cause, they said: "But though this point remains doubtful, we are decided in our opinion that the disorder has been supported, diffused and aggravated by the ready communication of contagion . . . and by the injury done to young persons through confinement and too long-continued labor, to which several evils the cotton mills have given occasion. We earnestly recommend a longer recess at noon and a more early dismissal from it in the evening, to all those who work in the cotton mills; but we deem this indulgence essential to the present health and future capacity for labor for those who are under the age of fourteen; for the active recreations of childhood and youth are necessary to the growth and right conformation of the human body. And we cannot excuse ourselves on the present occasion from suggesting . . . this further very important consideration, that the rising generation should not be debarred from all opportunities of instruction at the only season in life at which they can be properly improved." Thereupon the Manchester magistrates refused to allow "indentures of parish apprentices whereby they shall be bound to owners of cotton mills and other works in which children are obliged to work in the night or more than ten hours a day."

And yet we here in free America of the twentieth century allow by law children of twelve years to work twelve hours a day for five days in the week, sixty-six hours being the full week's work, and Georgia, one of the chief manufacturing States of the South, has no legal protection of the children from night work, or from being employed at the earliest age when their little hands could be of use. Only last month a child of seven years and nine months had its fingers cut off in a Georgia mill.

These same Manchester physicians, now constituted into a Board of Health, in 1796 passed the following resolutions, among others:

"The large factories are generally injurious to the constitution of those employed in them, from the close confinement which is enjoined, from the debilitating effects of hot or impure air, and from the want of the active exercises which nature points out as essential in childhood and youth to invigorate the system, and to fit our species for the employments and for the duties of manhood. The untimely labor of the night and the protracted labour of the day, with respect to children, not only tend to diminish future expectations as to the general sum of life and industry, by impairing the strength and destroying the vital stamina of the rising generation, but it too often gives encouragement to idleness, extravagance and profligacy in the parents, who, contrary to the order of nature, subsist by the oppression of their offspring.

"From the excellent regulations that subsist in several cotton factories, it appears that many of these evils may be in a considerable degree obviated; we are therefore warranted by experience, and are assured we shall have the support of the liberal proprietors of these factories, in proposing an application for parliamentary aid to establish a general system of laws for the wise, humane and equal government of all such works."

In 1801 a man named Jouvaux was sentenced to twelve months of hard labor himself as a punishment for overworking his young apprentices, and Judge Grose went on to say, in the opinion delivered, "If the manufacturers insist that without these children they could not advantageously follow their trade, he should say that trade must not, for the sake of filthy lucre, be followed, but at once, for the sake of society, be abandoned." It is still the pauper children that are the object of concern. In the following year, 1802, the first factory act was passed, limiting working hours to twelve a day, forbidding night work, providing for the instruction of the apprentices in reading, writing and arithmetic, and providing for systematic factory inspection. It is a disagreeable fact to state, but it must be confessed that this first attempt at remedial legislation for the protection of working children, more than a hundred years ago, is to-day ahead of the laws of the manufacturing States of the South in the matter of night work, of requiring educational facilities and in providing for factory inspection. The bill passed almost without opposition, but an amendment extending its provisions to all

manufactories and the persons employed in them was defeated, the distinction being drawn between apprentice labor and free labor.

It may be interjected here that there is still a sentiment against any interference by the State in behalf of the toiling children who are not fortunate enough to be paupers. But the act was ineffective, and soon the parish apprentice question became unimportant. The invention of the cotton gin in America and the application of steam power to machinery ushered in an era of immense development in manufacturing comparable only to the expansion of the manufacturing industries of the South in the last two decades. And now the manufacturer becomes an important personage, with whose business Parliaments and courts are reluctant to interfere. The history of English legislation for the first half of the nineteenth century is a dreary round of slow and ineffective experiment, with swift and effective evasion of the laws. Spencer Walpole says that it took twenty-five years of legislation to restrict a child of nine years to a sixty-nine hour week. It only took twenty years' experience with the cotton mills on a large scale in three or four Southern States to enact an age limit of twelve and a sixty-six hour week. Yet that limit is lowered to ten by the exceptions made in some States, so that we are not much farther along than the English act of 1819 that made a nine-year age limit and forbade any child under sixteen to work more than twelve hours a day. Robert Owen's long fight for legislation deserves to be remembered and the objections made show that errors are as old as their corresponding truths. He was asked if there would not be danger of the children's acquiring vicious habits for want of regular occupation. He replied that "their habits have been good in proportion to the extent of their instruction." We are familiar with the modern proposition that the cotton mill is a reformatory and that our boasted civilization is after all so rotten as to require the sentencing of a ten-year-old child to hard labor in the mill to keep it out of mischief. Yet the statistics taken in Pennsylvania show that the army of tramps and criminals is being recruited constantly and mainly from the ranks of the children whose lives have been embittered by too early toil.

Owen says: "The first plea of the objectors to my bill was that masters ought not to be interfered with by the legislature in any way in the management of their business. The next attempt was

to prove that it was not injurious to employ these young children fourteen or fifteen hours a day, in over-heated, close rooms, filled often with the fine flying fiber of the material used, particularly in cotton and flax spinning mills. Sir Robert Peel most unwisely consented to a committee being appointed to investigate this question, and this committee was continued for two sessions of Parliament before these wise and honest men, legislating for the nation, could decide that "such practices were detrimental to the health of these infants." Owen was himself a manufacturer, as was Sir Robert Peel, but his bill was amended in such important particulars as the requiring documentary proof of age. The testimony regarding the necessity for this bill is interesting. Owen said that children were employed commonly at five or six. Thomas Wilkinson thought that half the employees were under sixteen. The United States census for 1900 gives only twenty-five per cent. of the operatives in Southern cotton mills as under sixteen, though the percentage has probably increased since. In 1835, in England, it was found that 26 per cent. were still under eighteen. George Gould called attention to the low rate of wages for the adult laborer from the competition of the child laborer. And two of the doctors called before the committee gave evidence that they had been suborned to testify as to the innocuousness of working young children under nine fifteen hours a day. But only last year, in North Carolina, the testimony of two doctors was introduced to show that there was no need, from a hygienic point of view, for a law forbidding young girls under fourteen to stand at their work for twelve hours a day or for boys or girls under fourteen to work a twelve-hour night. There is nothing new under the sun and there is nothing true but heaven. There was another assumption that prevailed then, and continues even in democratic America, that the manual working people are a lower class, an order apart, to whom the ordinary rules even of humanity cannot apply. And then there was the argument that was dubbed "Manchesterism," a favorite principle of the political economists of that day, who were all against what we might call social legislation. It was that things were not so bad after all, and that the tendency was to right themselves through the ordinary laws of the business world.

The act of 1825 forbade children under sixteen working more
(318)

than twelve hours a day, and the act of 1831 extended this to children under eighteen. There was great difficulty in obtaining proof of the violations of the law, and factory operatives were blacklisted if they appeared as informers, something that was done in Georgia two years ago, the parents of children who had been brought before the Legislative Committee being dismissed from the mills. But the act of 1833 created factory inspectors and forbade night work for children under eighteen in any textile mills, except the silk mills, and restricted children under thirteen to forty-eight hours a week. Then began the long agitation for the ten-hour day, in the course of which Lord Ashley, the children's champion, was defeated by Lord Macaulay, who himself afterwards became a powerful advocate of the children's rights. Oastler, the author of "Yorkshire Slavery," was thrown into prison for conscience sake during this agitation, and his language was bitterly resented by the manufacturers. Mr. Samuel Townsend argues that "the occupation of the children is far from laborious, and consists chiefly in the quickness and attention given to the machine, allowing them abundant time to take refreshment during mill hours. I am convinced that the present method of bringing children forward to useful employment is far from being the 'horrid slavery of the worsted mills' (as Oastler had called it) that it is rendered a comfort by the regular hours of rising from and retiring to bed; and the most systematic regulation by which refreshments are brought to them." It may be interjected that it had already been admitted that the hours in the worsted mills were thirteen a day, and one great trouble was that the children were compelled to take part or all of the meal hour in cleaning the machinery. A significant statement is made about this time that "the labour in the mill is, strictly speaking, family labor, and that there is no longer the system of a parent maintaining his children by the operation of his own industry." That is the statement of an economic law, that in the occupations which admit of the wholesale employment of children, the whole family can make only as much wages as pater familias can in the trades that exclude children from employment.

The act of 1844 defined night work for women and children as the period between 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., and night work was forbidden. Birth registration had been made obligatory in 1837, and in this

matter our Southern States are behind. The act of 1844 was reconsidered, but passed again in 1847. This was followed by the definition of a normal day, to prevent the relay system, under which the operatives not protected by law were sometimes obliged to work fifteen hours a day, while the children were shifted about from one part of the factory to another. The difficulties of administration were great. There were forged certificates then, as now, and false swearing. A boy made quite a financial success by getting examined by different doctors and selling his certificates to other boys. Certificates were granted by dentists and cow doctors. But the principle had been established of the right of the State to interfere for its own sake as well as for the sake of the child. It was argued by Lord Macaulay, and his argument was prophecy, that "intense labor, beginning too early in life, continued too long every day, stunting the growth of the mind, leaving no time for healthful exercise, no time for intellectual culture, must impair all those high qualities that have made our country great. Your overworked boys will become a feeble and ignoble race of men, the parents of a more feeble progeny; nor will it be long before the deterioration of the laborer will injuriously affect those very interests to which his physical and moral interests have been sacrificed. If ever we are forced to yield the foremost place among commercial nations, we shall yield it to some people pre-eminently vigorous in body and in mind."

Lord Shaftesbury made the remark once that the child labor evil had spread from the cotton mills into other industries. The period between 1845 and 1861 was largely occupied with the inclusion of these other industries, one by one, within the law that had applied only to the cotton factories. The evil was found to be a hideous one in the print works, dyeing works, and bleaching establishments, and existed in lace works, pillow making, pottery trades, "each successive generation of potters becomes more dwarfed and less robust than the preceding one." The making of lucifer matches was especially hard upon the little folks, and children of four and five years were found in the straw-plaiting establishments. In 1862 there were employed some 120,000 operatives in the hosiery trades, much of the work being done by infant children in the homes, mothers pinning the little ones to their knees while at work to prevent their falling when going to sleep. In the hardware establishments of Birming-

ham, England, as late as 1864, 2,000 children under ten were found, half of these under eight. Then the act of 1867 extended to the hitherto unregulated industries. In 1874 the age limit was raised to ten for factories. But it was not until Booth's book on "Life and Labour in London" appeared that the act of 1891 was passed, extending the law to the sweat-shops. And the factory inspectors were too few for the additional tasks laid upon them by these extensions of the law. The act of 1895 fixed the hours at which a child should be employed at thirty a week, though allowing still twelve hours a day. But amendments as late as 1901 show that the laws are still imperfect. Some of our American States are already in advance of England after a century of legislation.

I have spoken of the half-time system. For the last fifty years the child has been allowed to go into the mill for half a day and then required to go to school the other half. This has been the cultivation of the mind at the expense of the physical man, and in its effects upon the constitution is hardly preferable to the long hours of the mill. Recently the Massachusetts law, requiring the illiterate child over fourteen to go to night school while working by day, until he could read and write, has been repealed, and the more merciful law substituted of forbidding any child under sixteen to work unless he can read and write. And now it would seem that we might expect some bad results from this hundred years of the exploitation of the children as laborers in what was once "Merrie England." The awakening came too late for England's comfort when, for the first time since the Crimean War, she engaged in conflict with a civilized people. Have you thought of the real reason for the impotence of that mighty nation when contending with a handful of South African farmers? We have heard the prophecy of the Manchester physicians, of Lord Macaulay, concerning the threatened degeneracy of the race. Let us see the fulfillment of prophecy.

Says John Dennis, in a magazine article during the current year:¹ "In the silent revolution that followed the abolishing of the Corn Laws, agriculture, which had been the backbone of English character and English strength, withered away. Vast areas devoted to the growing of wheat became hunting fields. The stout yeomanry, their country's pride, ceased to exist. England turned from agri-

¹ *Everybody's Magazine*, February, 1905, Article, "Hooligan."

culture to manufacturing; the country and the country town and the village began to dry up and a steady stream of indigent men and women poured into the great cities. . . .

The blow that the wise men had foreseen fell with the Boer War. In a day, as it seemed, the nation awoke to the fact that its physical vigor was sapped. It had no material for soldiers. The percentage of rejections at the enlistment stations appalled every reflective mind. The standards were lowered, the tests were made easy; the rejections continued to be most alarming. Regiments were patched together of boys and anemic youths. They were food for hospitals, not for powder. Once in South Africa enteric swept them off like flies; they were only the shells of men. There were other things equally disturbing. Men gathered from the dispatches that, as a matter of fact, the war was fought on the British side by the Colonials, Irish and Scotch. . . . There have been hints of worse revelations. A London newspaper asserted that of 11,000 men examined in Manchester, nearly 10,000 were rejected. . . . And the English people had always trusted so implicitly in their traditional physical stamina. And meanwhile, a change, tremendous, but unnoted, had gone on in the habits and stamina and physical type of that class of men that must ever make the rank and file of armies. The men that faced the Malakoff and stormed Sebastopol were no more. . . . When the typical Englishman of the class that went to war—the John Bull of tradition—was broad-shouldered and deep-chested, a ruddy-cheeked giant, then the brawn and endurance of the Englishman were a proverb. Against him Hooligan, anemic, neurotic, emaciated, too often degenerate, dull of wit and feeble of will, showed like a figure of fright. In 1903 in London, not fewer than 200,000 people are without anything that by any stretch of the imagination they can call home.

Dr. Robert Jones, an eminent London physician, wrote to the *Times* that not only was insanity among the masses constantly increasing, but it tended to assume worse forms, and that in 1,000 consecutive male cases between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five the average weight and stature were so far below the normal that he concluded that there was "an alarming impairment in national physique." Dr. Robert Farquson, another eminent physician, certified to the truth of these conclusions and told worse things. The

president of a Manchester Improvement Association testified that there were large districts in Manchester in which there were "no well-grown children or men or women except those who have been born in the country." What was it that the Manchester physicians foretold in 1784? "The untimely labour of the night and the protracted labour of the day, with respect to children, tends to diminish future expectations as to the general sum of life and industry by impairing the strength and destroying the vital stamina of the rising generation." What was it that Lord Macaulay, in 1846, prophesied? "Your overworked boys will become a feeble and ignoble race of men, the parents of a more feeble progeny. Nor will it be long before the deterioration of the labourer will injuriously affect those very interests to which his physical and moral energies have been sacrificed. If ever we are forced to yield the foremost place among commercial nations we shall yield it to some people pre-eminently vigorous in body and mind." That people is the German nation. And Germany is to-day pushing England to the wall in commercial competition and winning the enduring victories of peace.

Nor is that all. The cotton milling industry, which was first attacked for its horrible cruelty to young children and first had its evils corrected, legislation being long confined to the cotton mills, is the one bright spot to-day in English manufacturing life. Says a recent authority: "In spite of keenest foreign competition, the Lancashire cotton mill, in point of technical efficiency, now leads the world, and the Lancashire cotton spinner, once in the lowest depths of social degradation, now occupies, as regards the general standard of life as a whole trade, perhaps the foremost position among English wage-earners." The expansion of the industry in recent years is measured by the millions of spindles. Surely, if England, with her handicaps of distance from the cotton fields and the rising price of fuel, can thus make this industry, so long cursed with child labor and low wages, the foremost one as regards the condition of the wage-earner, the South should be able to do the same thing with her incalculable advantages over England or any other part of the world.

Once more, who are ruling England to-day? Take the new Cabinet. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is a Scotchman, as was Mr. Balfour, and as was Mr. Gladstone. Lord Elgin is a Scotchman.

Mr. Haldane is a Scotchman. James Bryce is an Irishman. Herbert Gladstone is a Scotchman's son. Sir Robert Reid is a Scot. John Burns is a Scot. Lord Tweedmouth is a Scot. David Lloyd-George is a Welshman. Who knows what unknown Cromwells have had their genius stifled in the atmosphere of the English mill? Scotch fathers sent their children to school while the English parent reversed the law of nature and of Scripture by allowing the child to work for him. And now Scotland rules the destinies of the British Empire.

And no one can pick up an English paper or read an English magazine without seeing something about the great and increasing army of the unemployed. Dr. S. M. Lindsay, secretary of our Child Labor Committee, made an investigation of conditions in England this past summer. And his testimony is that the unemployed are not those who will not work, but who are unable to meet the sharper conditions of modern manufacturing life, and that it is not the absence of work to be done, but that they cannot do the work that is required. In brief, they are "ineffectives."

So much for race degeneracy progressing for a hundred years in England to its dire culmination. But it is beginning already in the South. Just a few facts that are matters of common knowledge. There has already been developed in our cotton manufacturing communities a "factory type" easily recognizable, the children distinguished by their pallor and a certain sallowness of complexion. Early employment tends to independence of parental restraint. The breadwinner becomes a man too soon, and early marriages are the rule. There are widows in Georgia fourteen years of age. The wife and mother continues her work in the mill, since the wage of the husband is not enough for the support of the family. What must be the children born of such unions and their children? Diseases of the throat and lungs are common, and also diseases peculiar to women brought on by employment long continued at the critical period of a young girl's life. It was a true saying of John Ruskin, "It is a shame for a nation to make its young girls weary." The demand for the labor of children precludes their obtaining an education. The mill owners often build school houses, and the mill superintendents empty them of the children. Thus, without education of the mind, the training of the hand will not win promotion even in the cot-

ton mill for the unfortunate illiterate. The cotton mill village is generally isolated, and the operatives separate themselves from others, and often the church is as little able to get hold of them as the school. The mountains are being depopulated by the agents of the mills. I know of one little village railroad station in Western North Carolina whence fifteen hundred people went last year to the mills. And the growth of the industry indicates the alarming increase in the number of children that are employed. The Blue Book for 1904, already antiquated, shows that there are 238,000 operatives employed, instead of the 100,000 reported in the census of 1900. The president of the American Cotton Manufacturing Association declares that in North Carolina seventy-five per cent. of the spinners are fourteen or under fourteen. His predecessor in office says that only thirty per cent. of all the operatives are adults. Considering the percentage of child to adult labor as set forth in the last census, twenty-five per cent. for the South, there must be 60,000 children under sixteen in the Southern mills. But considering the imperfections of that census in this respect, considering the doubling of the number of operatives in many mills through the larger amount of night work now done under present prosperous conditions, considering the new mills in operation this year, there must be a quarter of a million of operatives now, and it is my calculation that there are 60,000 under fourteen, which is the age limit of most of our manufacturing States in America. Virginia and the two Carolinas and Alabama have an age limit of twelve. But the want of factory inspection precludes any enforcement of the law, even as it now stands, while Georgia has no child labor law, being the last of the manufacturing States of either Europe or America that has failed to adopt one. It is estimated that the number of spindles, and thus the number of operatives, and thus the number of children employed, will be doubled in the next five years.

But the National Committee has been organized in behalf of the children, and State committees are co-operating with it, and the pulpit and the press of the South are all but unanimous for protecting the children by law. Public sentiment is being aroused in no uncertain fashion, and the wrath of the people is being invoked

against our modern Herods who have sought the young child's life and are indifferent to the slaughter of the innocents.

When, during the Napoleonic wars, the manufacturers, suffering from the withdrawal of their employees into the ranks of the British armies, went to the younger Pitt with their complaint, he said to them, "Take the children." When it was proposed to the President of the Confederate States to lower the age limit for the enlistment of soldiers for the Confederate armies, he said: "We must not grind the seed corn." The little children of the South, with their heritage of heroic blood, untainted and pure, are the hope of the South and may yet prove to have been the hope of the nation as well. They are more precious than the dollars that can be coined by the sacrifice of their childhood, by the denial of childhood's right to play and to dream, of childhood's opportunity to learn. The child is the harbinger of the Golden Age that is to be. We must not crush his spirit with manhood's toil. The measure of the triumphs of the race that is to be is what we can accomplish for the child that is, for his protection, for his training, for his development physically, mentally, spiritually.

And it seems to me that the manufacturers of America should be the last to raise objection to the interference of the State in behalf of the child, seeing that the State has interfered in behalf of their profits. Tariff controversies aside, it is certain that the tariff benefits primarily the manufacturer. If then he demands protection by law against foreign competition, how can he claim that the State has no right to protect the life and health and morals of its future citizenship? How can he hold the position of claiming the right of "protection to infant industries and the exploitation of infant industry." The American people have dealt generously with their manufacturers. Let the manufacturers be no less generous with their country in this vital matter of preserving the integrity of the race.

Certainly they should beware of forcing upon the American people, for final action, the alternative mentioned in Judge Grose's opinion, already quoted. "If the manufacturers insist that without these children they could not advantageously follow their trade, he should say that trade must not, for the sake of filthy lucre, be followed, but at once for the sake of society be abandoned."